Civil Action No. 1:18cv1572 OPPOBOX, LLC, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

. Alexandria, Virginia vs.

December 21, 2018

1

AMERICAN REGISTRY FOR 11:08 a.m.

Defendant.

INTERNET NUMBERS, LTD.,

TRANSCRIPT OF TRO HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONIE M. BRINKEMA UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
 (telephonically) MICHAEL F. RUGGIO, ESQ.

Nelson Mullins Riley &

Scarborough LLP

101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Suite 900

Washington, D.C. 20001

FOR THE DEFENDANT: STEPHEN M. RYAN, ESQ.

JOSHUA D. ROGACZEWSKI, ESQ.

SAM C. NEEL, ESQ.

McDermott Will & Emery LLP

The McDermott Building

500 North Capitol Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001-1531

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:

ANNELIESE J. THOMSON, RDR, CRR U.S. District Court, Third Floor

401 Courthouse Square Alexandria, VA 22314

(703)299-8595

(Pages 1 - 19)

COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION OF STENOGRAPHIC NOTES

## PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: Civil Action 18-1572, Oppobox, LLC, et al. v. American Registry for Internet Numbers, Ltd. Would counsel please note their appearances for the record.

THE COURT: Mr. Ruggio, you're appearing via telephone; is that correct?

MR. RUGGIO: Yes, Your Honor, and I have to mention, Your Honor, that I called at 9:45 this morning, Your Honor, to make sure that I would know when a hearing would be set up, and I was told by the Clerk's Office they would contact me back. At that point, it had been scheduled with Judge Ellis.

And I just got notification it was transferred to you. No one's ever notified us whatsoever. We've been waiting here all morning to get a call that would say: We're going to have a hearing; get over here right away. We would have immediately been there.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to get into it with you, but I will tell you whatever phone number was first given to the Clerk's Office, we couldn't use. It didn't work. But in any case, you're on the phone. We're going to address this matter at this point.

It's been transferred to us. Judge Ellis recused himself from hearing this case. I don't know why, but anyway, we've got it. It was randomly reassigned to this Court.

And for the defense?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
MR. ROGACZEWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.
Rogaczewski, McDermott Will & Emery, LLP, for ARIN, the
defendant. I'm here with my partner, Steve Ryan, and my
colleague, Sam Neel. Prior to the hearing, I did move for
their admission pro hac vice.
          THE COURT: I've already signed the paperwork.
          Mr. Ryan, it's nice seeing you in court again.
          MR. RYAN: Your Honor, it's a true pleasure to be
back in your court, although perhaps not the day before the
holiday.
         Thank you.
          THE COURT: All right.
          MR. ROGACZEWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. So Mr. Ryan
will handle the hearing for ARIN, if that's okay.
          THE COURT: All right, that's fine.
          Well, I've had a chance to very quickly go over the
complaint, the motion for the temporary restraining order. I
have also looked at only some of the exhibits. The ones that I
was particularly interested in, frankly, were L, M, and N. I
also have briefly looked at Exhibit I, which appears to be, as
I understand it, the standard Registration Services Agreement
between the parties. I'm told at least from the paperwork that
apparently this is pretty uniform for all of the plaintiffs.
          I note that with the exception of seeking injunctive
relief, any dispute between you-all needs to go to arbitration,
if I read that correctly in the agreement.
```

```
4
 1
               MR. RUGGIO: That's correct, Your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT: All right. So we're before the Court.
 3
    Now, I'm very intrigued, and I'll let Mr. Ryan actually start,
 4
     so tell me about the litigation in South Carolina.
 5
               MR. RYAN: Oh, Your Honor, this is very interesting.
     Can I pass up two exhibits so that you can actually read the
 6
 7
    pleading in the South Carolina court as we're discussing it?
 8
               THE COURT: Only because we don't have the plaintiff
 9
    here to also look at it at the same time, can't you just give
10
     me a good executive summary?
11
               MR. RYAN: Absolutely, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: All right.
13
               MR. RYAN: Let me, let me do that. Your Honor, in
14
     the South Carolina case -- and I will tell you, by the way, let
15
     me just put in context we discovered the fraud in this case
16
     independently and then went and found the South Carolina case.
17
     In other words, the South Carolina case did not trigger our
18
     finding of the fraudulent activities on the part of the
19
     plaintiff.
20
               THE COURT: Okay.
21
               MR. RYAN: If we'd go to the South Carolina
22
     pleadings, the plaintiff, Mr. Golestan, sued his former
23
     employee.
24
               THE COURT: Right.
25
               MR. RYAN: That former employee in her counterclaim
```

and answer, at paragraph 129 and paragraph 130 of her answer to his attack on her, those paragraphs indicate that the person whose affidavit has been proffered by the plaintiffs in this case, Mr. Golestan, actually has a pattern of defrauding my client, ARIN, by creating false paperwork by alias people who don't exist, that are made up out of whole cloth, and this young woman was ordered to notarize the documents that we require to ensure that people understand that they shouldn't be trying to defraud us in getting the resources.

We hand out these resources, and she was, in essence, being used as part of the scheme and artifice to defraud by creating the notary seals on the false documents for the aliases.

I think actually there's four paragraphs, two paragraphs in her, her document, and two paragraphs in the answer. The reason I want to read the paragraphs of the allegation of the answer is because the plaintiff has, unbelievably, admitted the fraud in their answer. It's an admitted fact, and therefore, what the Court has here today, when I read you these paragraphs, you'll see -- I have never in 38 years seen somebody come into a court of equity with as unclean a set of hands and who's actually now trying to defraud you in addition to the fact that we've been defrauded, and I can prove that. I have a witness I'm prepared to put on today to that effect.

```
6
 1
               But let me read you two paragraphs. It's less than
 2
     half a page.
 3
               THE COURT: All right.
 4
               MR. RYAN: All right. So I'm reading from
 5
     Ms. Latham's response: Upon information and belief, plaintiff,
     that is, the affiant in this case, attempted to fraudulently
 6
 7
     grow its channel partner network by creating sham or straw
 8
     channel partners. These sham companies have nonexistent
 9
     individuals listed as the officers of the company -- companies,
10
     plural. For example, two of the plaintiff's channel partners,
11
     Oppobox, which is the plaintiff in this case, and Fiber Galaxy,
12
     are actually pure alter egos of the plaintiff. That's
13
     Mr. Golestan. The officers of Oppobox and Fiber Galaxy,
14
     respectively, Kevin Chang and Pooya Torabi, are not real
15
     people, despite the fact that these straw persons have apparent
16
     authority to act for these entities. E-mails to Chang and
17
     Torabi are actually received by officers of Micfo, which is
18
     Mr. Golestan's company where they're rolling the resources up
     to him. When Chang and Torabi sent e-mails, they are actually
19
20
     generated by officers of the plaintiff. It is believed the
21
     plaintiff has approximately ten alter ego channel partners that
22
     it fraudulently misrepresents to the world as being separate
23
     and independent companies run by real, existing people not
24
     associated with the plaintiff. That's paragraph 129.
```

Now, I'll read paragraph 130, and that's the last

paragraph I'll read from this:

Upon information and belief, the sham channel partners solve at least two problems for plaintiff. They provide plaintiff's client with a false sense of security, while plaintiff retains all the profits and fees for the service of these channel partners, and it diversifies plaintiff's risk if ARIN revokes certain agreements, licensures, and/or IP addresses of plaintiff or its channel partners. Given the diversification of channel partners, if one goes down, then the remaining undisciplined channel partners and/or plaintiff can continue to provide uninterrupted connectivity services to these illicit web companies, i.e., spam or criminal enterprises, or even legitimate clients, and continue to profit from the same.

Now, you don't need to actually believe her because if you ask plaintiffs' counsel, because he's a barred member of this Court, I believe he's going to have to admit that it's true, but I actually have his pleading for his client in South Carolina, and there are two paragraphs. This is his -- Micfo's answer to defendant Latham's counterclaims, two paragraphs, paragraph 13 and paragraph 20. They're shorter paragraphs,

Paragraph 13. Answering paragraph 129 of Latham's answer, Micfo admits that Kevin Chang and Pooya Torabi are aliases, the e-mails sent to Chang and Torabi are received by

- employees of Micfo, and that the e-mails sent from the aliases

  Chang and Torabi are sent by employees of Micfo.
- The last sentence is a general denial: Micfo denies the remaining allegations, express or implied, in the paragraph.
- So he -- the plaintiff in this case, who had the

  temerity to put an affidavit before you in this court to

  convince you as a court of equity to rule in his favor, not one

  word in their pleadings in a sense about this South Carolina

  matter, in the South Carolina matter.
- But let me read paragraph 20. Answering paragraph
  12 137 of Latham's -- oh, wait, I'm sorry. I'm in the wrong
  13 place. 14? I'm sorry.

MR. RUGGIO: Your Honor, can I object for a minute, Your Honor? Because it's kind of bizarre to me, Your Honor, that we're dealing with a case in South Carolina which is historical. What this has been brought on for is an anticipatory breach by the defendant by threatening to revoke everything.

We've been trying to work with this defendant over the last several weeks to try and see how we can resolve some of these things, and we even up until yesterday attempted to do so, Your Honor. The reason this action is before you, Your Honor, is because defendant has been adamant by threatening a revocation of everything across the board, and they have never

at this point, never in weeks of going forward mentioned this case, bringing this up.

We've been very transparent with the defendant across the board. What we seek and we're trying to do is trying to keep a status quo such that we could try and see if there's possibility to resolve or arbitrate this case. That's always been our intention, even up until yesterday evening.

It's when Mr. Ryan was adamant by the fact that he was not going to give that assurance that we had to protect our clients' interest across the board because he has the power as a monopoly to cut everything off no matter what has happened.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. RUGGIO: And all we've attempted to do here, Your Honor, is try to stop that process until we can get to a point we can arbitrate pursuant to the agreement the terms of this situation.

THE COURT: Here's my concern, because, again, I've had roughly maybe 45 minutes to try to get up to speed in this case: Paragraph 2(d) of your agreement includes as prohibited conduct to violate any applicable laws, statutes, rules, or regulations.

This whole area of the Internet and the cloud and I, frankly, have never heard of fog service, but gives me great concern when I'm hearing that there may be false names, nonexistent entities, that sort of thing. There's been now

- 1 some brief reference to the possibility of any kind of criminal
- 2 | conduct that may be conducted across these Internet portals.
- 3 That is such murky business that sitting as a court in equity,
- 4 I'm not at this point going to go ahead and grant any kind of a
- 5 restraining order because I simply don't have enough
- 6 information.
- My understanding is the defendant, Mr. Ryan, is a
- 8 | nonprofit; is that correct?
- 9 MR. RYAN: Yes, ma'am. We're a nonprofit. We're
- 10 | located in Chantilly, Virginia, and we're one of five utilities
- 11 around the world that do this, so our organization takes care
- 12 of Canada, the United States, and all of the English and French
- 13 | islands of the Caribbean. It's about a
- 14 | 20-25-million-dollar-a-year operation. We have about 70
- 15 employees, about 70 employees.
- If you want to think about what we are, Your Honor,
- 17 DARPA invented the Internet. The National Science Foundation
- 18 took over the operation. The National Science Foundation is my
- 19 mother on this. She mothered it out to us. We took it over,
- 20 and industry is running it.
- 21 Let me say something --
- 22 THE COURT: It's like ICANN and those other private
- 23 entities that are doing what used to be a quasi-governmental
- 24 function.
- MR. RYAN: That's exactly right, but ours is

filings is totally accurate and true.

25

What Mr. Ryan wants to do, he's muddied this whole thing up -- and I kind of feel at a disadvantage not being able to be there, Your Honor -- in any way he can to try and control the situation where he can revoke or threaten to revoke anyone and maybe set a new standard where they as a monopoly can really run roughshod over anybody they give out IP addresses to.

THE COURT: All right. Well, look.

MR. RUGGIO: This is totally inappropriate.

THE COURT: Here is the situation: Again, as I've said, I am a court sitting in equity. You have to convince the Court at this point -- and the burden is on you, not on the defendant -- that you're entitled to this extraordinary relief, which courts are very reluctant to grant. I am not satisfied that you have convinced me of a likelihood of success on the merits.

I read -- as I said, the key exhibits that I read, in my view, showed recalcitrance on your part to provide the defendant with the information they were requesting, which struck the Court as being reasonable information. I think you claimed it was proprietary or, you know, information, and based upon what I have in the record before me, I don't even need to hear anything more from Mr. Ryan at this point. The motion for a temporary restraining order is denied.

Now, down the road, if you want to revisit this

- 1 issue, next week is a difficult week. I am here but staff is
- 2 thin. If something else is presented to the Court, we'll take
- 3 | a look at it, but at this point, I've denied the motion.
- 4 | That's the only issue that's before me right now.
- 5 Obviously, there's nothing that prevents the parties
- 6 | from resolving their dispute. If it can't be resolved, then
- 7 | we'll probably see you down the road, but because this case
- 8 does appear -- the ultimate issues in this case would appear to
- 9 be only subject to arbitration, this case may not last very
- 10 long on the docket.
- MR. RYAN: Can I, can I say something, though, about
- 12 | the arbitration issue?
- 13 THE COURT: Yeah.
- 14 MR. RYAN: Because it weighs on the Court that
- 15 | really -- we set up arbitration as the mechanism. Every
- 16 | contract here is false. It was with an alias or a person who
- 17 | didn't exist. We were induced to contract with someone who
- 18 | doesn't exist, and we would never have given the addresses to
- 19 them.
- 20 Let me explain the value of the addresses to the
- 21 | Court, and if --
- MR. RUGGIO: I'm going to object, Your Honor, because
- 23 | I think at this point, Your Honor, you've made a ruling, and
- 24 | we'll consider whether we'll file for a rehearing on that, but
- 25 I think at this point, you've made a ruling, Your Honor. I

really have objection to Mr. Ryan going on about things that I can't be present to to challenge it in person.

THE COURT: Well, you're present on the phone, and you have a good, strong voice, so we're hearing you loud and clear. I'm going to let Mr. Ryan finish.

Go ahead, Mr. Ryan.

MR. RYAN: Let me just finish. When the Internet was created, there were 4 billion numbers that were 32-bit combination numbers. There are only 4 billion possible 32-bit numbers. That's what IPv4 is, Internet Protocol version 4. We're now issuing Internet Protocol version 6, and we will be using that for 300 to 1,000 years.

In this interregnum period where people are switching from v4 to v6, the v4 addresses have monetary value, and ARIN created a transfer market where someone who is a legitimate holder of resources, which the plaintiff is not, can sell the rights to those numbers to others.

The plaintiff has already transferred numbers to China and Saudi Arabia in the, in the recent past. Those numbers are in all likelihood blocks that should never have been granted to them, but they've monetized it, and one of the agreements that I had with counsel in writing is that they would tell us what was the monetary value they derived from those blocks, and I will tell you that based on the number of resources, it's what we call a /16, which is 65,000 numbers.

here, it's my client.

- Each number is worth no less than \$10 an address, and right
  now, I'm told the market price is 19 to 20. So if you multiply
  the 65,000 in that one block that was transferred out to China
  and Saudi Arabia, you can see the profit that is made by
  selling the addresses by a party who has defrauded us to obtain
  them. So if anyone should be asking for a restraining order
  - Now, the problem with the, with the arbitration clause, it's arbitration in a contract that is fraudulently obtained in a sense, and they've brought that issue on before you. So I do think the proper resolution here is for the Court to order the following:
  - Point 1, that they be ordered to produce the customer list and customer coordinates: the address, the telephone number of those -- of the customers of all of the businesses who are the plaintiffs.
  - We will agree to receive that under any appropriate nondisclosure agreement. In other words, we will not disclose that to any third party, but I do want to tell the Court that if the Court orders them to turn that over to us, we will do what we always do when we get such a list. We'll randomly choose people and try and find out if there's really a person there.
  - Now, let me tell you why I care about that. If we have a defrauding party who's the ISP or service provider like

the plaintiff, there may be real parties who depend on their services. I'd like to find that out. The only reason we haven't revoked to date is because I was asking for that information first from the company itself and then from me to see if we could get that, and that's why I think the Court having jurisdiction of the TRO/PI matter should ask for the production of those materials subject to an appropriate protective order to us so we can find out if there really are customers there.

The second thing that I think the Court should order is that Mr. Golestan sit for a deposition within this district, having subjected himself to the Court's jurisdiction with his affidavit, for a period of eight hours so that we can put documents to him and he can confirm under oath that those persons don't exist and are aliases.

MR. RUGGIO: Your Honor, I'm going to object to both of those things. He's bringing on all kinds of desires and claims that he wants on a TRO that you've already ruled on, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I will tell you this: Because your concern, your concern -- and that's what you've got in your, in your motion -- is potential injury to customers who are using your service, he's given you an opportunity to avoid that problem. To the extent you've got legitimate customers who are relying on the fog or the cloud or whatever the services that

- 1 you-all make possible, you can avoid that problem by complying
- 2 | with his request. The fact that it would be under a
- 3 | nondisclosure agreement should give you adequate protection if
- 4 you're acting in good faith.
- 5 So at this point, I think it's not an unreasonable
- 6 request.
- 7 MR. RYAN: Your Honor, I'll go further. Let me --
- 8 | it's like a Ginsu knife. Let me add to the deal. I literally
- 9 | will not revoke anything until we receive that list, take that
- 10 deposition. I won't take advantage of the fact that there's no
- 11 TRO today until I know whether there are customers there if
- 12 your order comes down. If not, I have to make a more difficult
- decision of how to proceed because they've refused to provide
- 14 that.
- The third element, Your Honor, is I want them to tell
- 16 us how much money was obtained in return for the resources that
- 17 have previously been transferred to China and to Saudi Arabia
- 18 so the Court will have a data point of what the monetary value
- 19 of these numbers is to judge the nature of the fraud that we're
- 20 dealing with. It's, it's -- they literally made this money on
- 21 a specific set of blocks. That will tell the Court what the
- 22 portfolio of numbers is worth and what the fraud was worth, and
- 23 | I'm representing to the Court that it's more than \$10 million.
- 24 | Somewhere between 10 and 20 million dollars is the nature of
- 25 the fraud.

This is not a small case. And the importance to the Internet of this is nobody's ever come into court like this for a TRO against us. In fact, nobody in 20 years has ever asked for an arbitration. This is the first. And so people are going to pay attention to what happens here and how someone — how the Internet really operates from it.

Thank you, Your Honor, for hearing me.

MR. RUGGIO: Your Honor, I'm going to object to the request of Mr. Ryan. I don't think we're here for this. I don't see how this is applicable to the TRO, and I don't see where the Court is in a position to order these things, Your Honor.

My, my client doesn't -- he's not a resident here. He may subject himself pursuant to the filing, but to order a deposition, to order these specific productions, the Court is making decisions on what Mr. Ryan is saying to you and just taking what he's saying to you at face value, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You understand, though, your position has just totally undercut the equitable argument that somehow your client would be, you know, harmed to a degree that can't be remediated. I mean, you've been offered the opportunity to keep these channels open with what seems to the Court to not be unreasonable requests, but since you're not willing to accept them, my ruling today is simple: The motion for a temporary restraining order is denied.